

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,640	02/07/2001	Babak Nemati	· · · · · ·	4426
7:	590 05/15/2003			
	Suzannah K Sundby	EXAMINER		
Jacobson Holman PLLC The Jenifer Building			HAYES, MICHAEL J	
400 Seventh Street NW Washington, DC 20004-2201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	1.5
			DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003	(0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	.		N.K.			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	_	09/777,640	NEMATI, BABAK			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Michael J Hayes	3763			
Period fo		cation appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failui - Any re	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION IS SOME MAY SOME THE PROVISION OF THE PROVI	of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep	ly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>28 <i>February</i> 2003</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL.	2b)☐ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) 🖾	Claim(s) 37-69 is/are pending in the	application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	re withdrawn from consideration.				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) 37-69 is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers		·			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 February 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
,	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.				
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in Ap	plication No			
* 0	application from the Intern	of the priority documents have been r ational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). n for a list of the certified copies not re	·			
		or domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §				
•						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☑ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachmen		A) 🗖 1	ummany (PTO 412) Paper No(a)			
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) P	TO-948) 5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
	1.0%					

Application/Control Number: 09/777,640

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 37-56, 62, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MARTINEZ (U. S. Patent No. 4,222,375). Martinez discloses an apparatus capable of enhancing the optical transparency of biological tissue comprising means for bypassing the surface barrier (needle), means for delivering clarifying agent (syringe), means for delivery of light (fiber optic cable). The various uses recited in the claims are readable on the prior art because the prior art is capable of performing these functions and supplying light for these functions.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37-52, 54-56, 62-64, 66, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of CHAN et al. (6,275,726). Chan discloses means for bypassing the surface permeability barrier of tissue, means for delivering a clarifying agent, and means of light delivery for diagnostic and therapeutic applications (1:50-65; 2:24-32; 3:51-67; 4:1-12; 7:36-63; 8:37-40). The various skin appendages will inherently be affected when the agent is injected into the tissue. Chan does not disclose the various parts to be used in one apparatus; however, it is

Application/Control Number: 09/777,640

Art Unit: 3763

well within the knowledge of the skilled artisan to make that which comprises plural parts into one part to simply the use of a device.

Claims 53, 57-59, 61, 65, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARTINEZ as applied to claims 37 and 38 above, and further in view of EDWARDS (U. S. Patent No. 5,833,647). Martinez discloses the claimed invention except for bypassing means including iontophoresis system, electric pulse generator, acoustic generator, and temperature gradient. Edwards teaches using these methods which inherently require the appropriate systems and generators to drive molecules. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Edwards in the invention of Martinez in order to deliver the agent across the skin barrier.

Claims 60 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MARTINEZ as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of WEAVER (U. S. Patent No. 5,019,034). Martinez discloses the claimed invention except for bypassing means to apply optical pressure and penetrating solvent. Weaver teaches the use of means to apply optical pressure and penetrating solvent for transdermal delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to facilitate delivery of an agent across the skin barrier.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-69 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant should note that the examiner considers the newly added limitation of one apparatus as an obvious variant to the prior art. Specifically, making something into one

Application/Control Number: 09/777,640

Art Unit: 3763

apparatus that was previously comprised of two apparatus would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. The mere combining of the apparatus without a more specific recitation of the structural relationship between the parts would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Apparatus consists of several parts and the addition of more parts whose function was disclosed in the prior art to be used with the original apparatus would be obvious to the skilled artisan.

Conclusion

If Applicant desires an interview he should contact the examiner at the number below to arrange a date and time.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/777,640

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Hayes at (703) 305-5873. The examiner can usually be reached Monday -Thursday, 7:00-4:30, and on alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler, can be contacted at (703) 308-3552. The fax number for submitting official papers is (703) 872-9302. The fax number for submitting after final papers is (703) 872-9303.

mjh 12 May 2003

> MICHAEL J. HAYES PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michael / Hayes